alleviate feminine disorders. It corrects them gently and safely. Daily Use of Takara * * * possible for the busiest woman to provide herself with this safe hygienic protection; a daily protection that means as much to her health as care of the teeth * * * To miss even one Takara treatment is to lose part of the gain made * * * Takara is a remedy so precautionary, safe and healing * * * Common Sore Throat, Gargle throat every two or three hours * * * Skin irritations * * * To allay itching and inflamation bathe affected parts."

On September 16, 1931, Raymond E. Taylor, owner of Takara Laboratories, Portland, Oreg., having appeared as claimant for the product and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, conditioned in part that the pamphlet containing the objectionable statements be removed from the packages, and that the article should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act, or the laws of any State, Territory, District, or insular possession.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

18972. Adulteration and misbranding of Co-Liv-Ol. U. S. v. Silmo Chemical Co. (Inc.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 26667. I. S. No. 9770.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Co-Liv-Ol, from the shipment herein described showed that the article was represented to be an emulsion of cod-liver oil and to contain vitamin D, whereas it contained a negligible amount of cod-liver oil and was practically valueless as a source of vitamin D. The article was contained in cans, the labels of which bore statements representing that it possessed curative and therapeutic properties which, in fact, it did not possess.

At the September, 1931 term of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, the United States attorney for said district, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court aforesaid an information against the Silmo Chemical Co. (Inc.), a corporation, Vineland, N. J., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about January 14, 1931, from the State of New Jersey into the State of Maryland, of a quantity of the said Co-Liv-Ol, which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of a fish oil, calcium and magnesium carbonates, small proportions of iron and aluminum compounds, and water. Biological examination showed that the article was virtually devoid of vitamin D, one of the therapeutically important constituents of cod-liver oil.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, since it was represented to be an emulsion of cod-liver oil and to contain vitamin D, whereas it was not emulsion of cod-liver oil and contained no vitamin D.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Dried Emulsion of Cod Liver Oil, * * * It retains the valuable vitamine D, reinforced and standardized with Irradiated Ergosterol, the concentrated Vitamine D, * * * Cod liver oil with the aid of an emulsifying agent has been dried as Co-Liv-Ol * * * and the tendency of the liquid to lose its vitamines quickly * * * has been controlled," borne on the label attached to the cans, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article was emulsion of cod-liver oil and contained vitamin D, whereas it was not emulsion of cod-liver oil and contained no vitamin D. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that certain statements regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of the article, appearing on the labels of the cans containing the said article, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was composed of or contained ingredients or medicinal agents effective, among other things, as a preventive of leg weakness and effective to build better bone; whereas it was not effective as a preventive of leg weakness, or effective to build better bone.

On October 16, 1931, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.